



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Synopses of Important Articles.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW TESTAMENT JUDAISM. By PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH.D., in *The Bibliotheca Sacra* for April 1893, pp. 193-219.

The idea of one God controlling the whole universe and all peoples is distinctively a revealed idea, and is the peculiar possession of ancient Israel. The effect of the exile was to strengthen this idea. The disintegrating process which set in with the conquest of the Orient by Alexander the Great, and to which other nations fell an easy prey, only intensified Israel's consciousness of being a peculiar people, with a most important historical mission to perform. Yet when Christ appears we find him in antagonism with the Judaism of his day. A right conception of the nature of this antagonism is necessary to a true interpretation of Christ's teachings, since his teaching was constantly presented in opposition to the current Judaism. But when we speak of Judaism we must in fact refer chiefly to the doctrines of the Pharisees, who without doubt represented the controlling religious thought of the times. Three great features of the Pharisaism opposed by Jesus may be named. First and fundamental is its erroneous conception of the Kingdom of God. By this term the Pharisees meant, to be sure, the development and realization of the prophetic ideal, yet they had in fact despiritualized that ideal. It is indeed a mistake to suppose that the ideal of the Pharisees was political. What they looked for was not a new state, but the supremacy of the law in the life of the people. Their hope was that when the proper time should come, Israel as a nation, or better still, as a religious sect, as an international religious communion of law-observers, would become partakers of the promised glories of the Messianic rule. The error of this conception was that it emphasized the national idea instead of the spiritual idea as the principal feature of the kingdom of God. It lost sight of the reality of sin, and of the consequent need of a spiritual transformation in order to the realization of the kingdom of God. A second error of the Pharisaic teaching was that, for faith as the normal relation of man to God, it substituted the nomistic (legalistic) principle. Thus instead of looking for a spiritual transformation attained through the exercise of faith in God, the Pharisees looked for a national and essentially worldly exaltation of Israel through a formal observance of law. A third characteristic of the Judaism of the New Testament times was the relatively small place which the person of the Messiah filled. It was the blessings of the Messianic age that were desired; and these were of such a character as to leave only a subordinate place for the Messiah himself.

In all these respects we see only a one-sided development of a biblical idea, a thrusting into the prominent place of what the Old Testament made subordinate. As respects the origin of New Testament Judaism, this is to be found in the establishment of the nomistic principle by Ezra and his coadjutors as the sole controlling principle of the religious life of the people. The post-exilic history of Israel acted to confirm this tendency. The Maccabean wars were fought in defence of *the law*, and the whole opposition of pious Israel to the paganizing influence of Hellenism acted in the same direction, emphasizing legalism.

A valuable article upon a topic most important for the right understanding of the teaching of Jesus. We shall never fully comprehend what Christ taught till we understand the views of those to whom his teachings were in the first instance addressed. The title is possibly a little obscure. It means not the true Judaism which Jesus and the New Testament writers presented, but the Judaism of the New Testament times, the Judaism which Jesus opposed. The theory of the article respecting the origin of this type of Judaism, viz., that it sprang from Ezra, is in the form in which it is presented a little startling. Especially does it seem strange in view of the author's previous assertion that Jesus defended the true Old Testament ideal of the kingdom of which New Testament Judaism presented a corrupted form. It may be questioned whether the author has not somewhat over-stated the spirituality of the ideal of the kingdom presented by the Old Testament prophets in general, if not also the legalism of Ezra in particular, thus creating a sharper antithesis between the prophets and Ezra than the facts altogether justify.

E. D. B.

THE EVIDENCE OF THE PSALTER TO A LEVITICAL SYSTEM. By Rev. HENRY HAYMAN, D.D., in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for April, 1893. Pages 238-60.

The Book of Psalms, according to recent theories, ought to mark a great advance on the pre-exilic prophets in the evidence of Levitical ordinances, their value and obligatory character—not, of course, as set forth in formal detail, but as extolled in religious sentiment. Prof. Robertson Smith states (O. J. C., p. 242) that, whereas, “in the Levitical System access to God . . . was only attained through the mediation of Aaronic priests at the central sanctuary,” and whereas “the ordinary Israelite meets there with God only on special occasions, and during the greater part of his life must . . . stand afar off,” “the reformers of Israel [the earlier prophets] strove against the lapses of Israel into idolatry, but not on the ground of the Levitical theory of Israel's absolute separation from the nations, or of a unique holiness radiating from one sanctuary, and descending in widening circles, through priests and Levites, to the ordinary Israelite. The history itself does not accept the Levitical standard.” What part does the evidence of the Psalter play in this question? According to Prof. Smith it was “the service book of the second temple.” As such it should especially emphasize those elements which, according to him, are absent in the pre-exilic prophets. In the first place, we present the question

of exaltation of moral duties, etc., either absolutely or as compared with ritual generally, and Levitical sacrifices and ceremonies in particular. In this question are involved those of Israel's absolute separation, of a unique holiness, etc., of consecration of tabernacle, brazen altar, and Aaronic privilege:

1. The requirement of moral, etc., dispositions as preferred to outward rite is illustrated in scores of passages, e. g., Ps. 4:5, "offer the sacrifices of righteousness;" 15:1 sq.; 24:3 sq.; 114:12; 26:6. The contrast between the Levitical and moral standards is brought out especially in Ps. 40:6-8, 9-10. To change over to Ps. 79 we find "Jerusalem in heaps," with cries to God for salvation and for retribution upon the enemy (vss. 9-12), and no reference at all to sacrifices or Levitical standards; cf. also Ps. 106: 16, 17. The longest and one of the latest contributions to the Psalter, Ps. 119, contains nothing by which one could prove the existence of a priestly code, or of the appointed Levitical *media*.

Neither in the pre-exilic prophets, nor in the Psalter, in its earlier productions, are the material *media* of worship disowned or rejected. They have a place, but beside the moral and spiritual requirements that place is infinitely low. With the sanctuary, the temple, the oracle, the house, we find the servants, the Aaronic priesthood who ministered therein, clothed with righteousness and with salvation, and filled with an holy unction.

2. What evidence now does the Psalter adduce to the existence of a written code of laws? In all its references to the exodus and wilderness wanderings there is not the slightest evidence to any Mosaic legislation. There is not a passage as strong as Mal. 4:4: "Remember ye the law of Moses, my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel." So far from "the ordinary Israelite meeting with God only on special occasions," the uniform burden of the Psalms is the directness of personal access to God. If the prophets, as alleged, have little to show in the way of testimony to the requirements of a code, the Psalter has equally little. If positive evidence to a *corpus juris* is not deducible from the prophetic writings, in the Psalter it is a total blank. Since the evidence from the Psalter for such a written *corpus* is thus weak precisely at the period when it might be expected to be strongest, it is entirely safe to dismiss any presumption against that written *corpus* as existing in the time of Amos and Isaiah which arises from the evidence presented by them. The lesson to be learned from the whole array of evidence in the prophets, and in the Psalter alike, is in fact the weakness of negative evidence, of *argumentum e silentio*. Those who deny the existence of a written law and a Levitical practice conformable to it in the pre-Babylonian period, on the ground that the prophets do not recognize the one and depreciate as far as they recognize, the other, are therefore in the logical error of proving too much.

Since the appearance of Canon Cheyne's Bampton Lectures, the dates of the Psalms have assumed a new importance. The author of the above article offers the

result of his study both as antagonistic to Cheyne's Maccabean lodestone and Robertson Smith's lawless prophetic periods. His conclusions are worth careful consideration, and, in certain respects, must modify the bold assertions of dogmatists. PRICE.

PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY: IV. THE EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS. By Rev. PROF. A. B. BRUCE, D.D., in *The Expositor*, for April, 1893.

Among the Greeks in Corinth the anti-Paulinists could not hope to succeed in destroying a free and independent Christianity, except by a circuitous course. They could not directly teach their own doctrines, but they might assail the man who taught doctrines of an opposite nature, might blacken his character, and undermine his apostolic standing. Hence there is very little bearing on the great Judaistic controversy in the first epistle, though allusions are not absent. The existence of a Judaistic leaven in the Corinthian Church, even when the first epistle was written, best explains 1 Cor. 9:1-6, where Paul seems to be on the defensive, and where the leading points of his apology for his assailed apostolic standing can be discovered. I am an apostle, he says in effect, because (1) I have seen the Lord, (2) I have been signally successful in my preaching, (3) I have endured hardships in the cause. These arguments are fully expanded in the second epistle. His whole defense rests on the general axiom that the qualifications for the Christian apostleship are spiritual, and not technical.

1. His first line of defence is that *he has seen the Lord*, primarily on the way to Damascus, but chiefly in that vision of Jesus with the eye of the spirit which enabled him to gain an insight into the true meaning of Christ's whole earthly history, 2 Cor. 3:18; 4:6. In matters of fact pertaining to the life of Jesus, the testimony of the other apostles possessed unique authority. But as to the religious significance of these facts, he speaks with superior authority who best understands them. In this respect Paul's vision of the spirit put him on an equality with the chiefest of the apostles. Paul, however, does not go to the length of assuming that apostolic authority rests on spiritual insight only. He regards the apostles as exceptional characters, not merely in view of the measure of their inspiration, but because they were eye-witnesses of the resurrection. Hence the stress which he lays on the fact of having himself seen Jesus.

2. The second line of defence is, *success in the work of the apostleship*. Paul frequently refers to his success, not in a spirit of boasting, but in the way of serious argument and self-defence, 1 Cor. 15:10; 2 Cor. 2:14; 3:18; 4:16. He would have the Corinthians carefully consider what this success meant, and takes pains in the sequel to make them understand its significance. It was a proof of sufficiency, or fitness, for the work, 2 Cor. 2:16. This sufficiency he fully defines by showing that it is insight into, and thorough sympathy with, the genius of the Christian religion. The second line of defence

thus runs up into the first, 2 Cor. 3:6-11. Of his own fitness to proclaim the religion of spirit, of life, and of righteousness, he having by a bitter experience proved legalism to be a religion of condemnation and death, he says nothing directly, but doubtless thinks of it as he writes. Instead he refers to another element of sufficiency, *straightforward sincerity*, in contrast with the double dealing of his opponents. His argument now takes this turn. The religion of spirit and life, eternal because perfect, 2 Cor. 3:11, has nothing to hide; the better it is known the more acceptable it will be; it is only the religion of written rules, and legal bondage, and fear, that needs a veil to cover its inherent defects.

3. But the treasure is in a fragile earthen vessel, and this may seem to detract from its fitness. Just the contrary. "I have," he says in effect, "earned the right to be regarded as the Apostle to the Gentiles by manifold sufferings endured in connection with my work." In the second epistle he urges this plea with such force and iteration, that the passages in which it recurs, 2 Cor. 4:7—5:10; 6:5-10; 11:23-33, rise to the dignity and grandeur of the greatest utterances to be found within the whole range of tragic poetry, and constitute together what might not unfitly be called the "Pauline Iliad."

The last four chapters of the second epistle are distinguished by a bitterly controversial tone. A probable explanation is that in the former part the apostle has in his view mainly the faithful majority in the Corinthian Church, while in the latter part he turns his attention to the minority by whose malign influence the others had temporarily been misled. These four chapters contain copious material bearing on all the three branches of Paul's argument in defence of his apostleship. To the first belongs 12:1-6; to the second, 10:12-18, where he lays stress on the *pioneering* character of his work, no less than on its extent; and to the third, over and above the long catalogue of woes, all the places in which Paul alludes to his refusal to receive from the church of Corinth any contributions toward his maintenance. His enemies were too selfish to understand the generous motives from which he acted, and insinuated that his collections for the poor in Palestine went into his own pocket, while he pretended to be very independent. If he were sure of his apostolic standing, would he not claim maintenance from his converts like the other apostles? This seems to be the sense of 2 Cor. 12:16-18.

This article continues Professor Bruce's thoughtful series on Paul's conception of Christianity. It contributes little toward the elucidation of this conception, because the doctrinal element in the letters to the Corinthian church is wholly subordinate to the apologetic. Of the latter the above article gives a masterly exposition.

P. A. N.